



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/685,286	10/10/2000	Anoop Tripathi	00-468	4563
20306	7590	09/27/2004	EXAMINER	
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP			RYMAN, DANIEL J	
300 S. WACKER DRIVE			ART UNIT	
32ND FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL 60606			2665	

DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/685,286

Applicant(s)

TRIPATHI, ANOOP

Examiner

Daniel J. Ryman

Art Unit

2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13 and 38 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 October 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered. The references cited on page 11, lines 1-6 of the specification should be included in an IDS.

### ***Drawings***

2. Figures 1-3 have been designated by the legend --Prior Art--; however, these figures are referenced in the specification as being part of the invention (page 3, lines 6-13; page 4, lines 3-4; page 7, lines 14-16; and page 11, lines 8-10). Since the Figures appear to be prior art, given the context of the Figures in the Specification, Examiner suggests changing "a block diagram illustrating a network telephony system according to an exemplary embodiment of the present invention" to "a block diagram illustrating a prior art network telephony system upon which an exemplary embodiment of the present invention operates". A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 9, line 14 "returns a 200 OK response" should be "returns a "200 OK" response" in order to avoid

confusing the "200 OK" response with the "Invite Request 200". On page 7, lines 28-29 it is disclosed that the proxy is located in the same domain as the device in the "From" field; however, the Figure discloses that the proxy is located in the same domain as the device in the "To" field. This discrepancy should be corrected.

Appropriate correction is required.

4. Examiner requests that the application information seen on page 5, line 10-page 7, line 12 of the specification be updated in order to reflect the changes in the status of any of the applications.

#### ***Claim Objections***

5. Claims 13 and 38 are objected. Claims 13 and 38 appear to be directed to the situation where the backup server has taken over for the active server since the backup receives a message from a first network entity; however, this is not specified in the claim language. As written, the backup will always receive a message from the first network entity and transmit this message to a second network entity regardless of whether the active proxy is operating or not. Thus, Examiner suggests amending claims 13 and 38 to include a limitation indicating that the receiving and transmitting is only performed when the primary proxy has failed. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2665

7. Claims 16 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claims 16 and 41 disclose that the first network entity (taken to mean first user agent) transmits a signal that includes an AlternatePath tag in the header; however, the specification never discloses how the first user agent is able to obtain the AlternatePath tag for the header. In the specification, the AlternatePath tag is inserted by the proxy and then used by the second user agent to determine where to direct transmissions after an active proxy has failed. Since Examiner cannot determine the metes and bounds of the claim, Examiner will not examine claims 16 and 41.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-4, 8-15, 17-21, 25-33, 37-40, 42, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar (USPN 6,473,396) in further view of Kadansky et al (USPN 6,507,562).

10. Regarding claims 1 and 18, Applicant admits as prior art a system and method for providing fault tolerance in a network telephony system at a primary proxy server, the system comprising means for and the method comprising steps of: receiving a first signaling message from a first network entity (first user agent) via a network (Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4,

Art Unit: 2665

line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29); determining a second network entity (second user agent) to which a second signaling message is to be transmitted (Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29); and transmitting the second signaling message to the second network entity via the network (Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29). Applicant does not disclose as prior art inserting a path attribute in the second signaling message, wherein the path attribute includes at least one network address corresponding to a backup proxy server. Kumar teaches, in a system for implementing module redundancy, having standby server modules for server modules performing critical functions, having client nodes detect a failure of an active server module, and having client nodes adjust their addressing to a standby module to resume normal operation (col. 2, lines 20-34) in order to have a simplified changeover scheme (col.3, lines 35-55). Specifically, Kumar discloses that, when clients detect a failure of an active module indicated by the client not receiving an "echo" from an active module, the client adjusts its address table to replace the address of the failed active module with the predetermined address of a standby module (col. 5, lines 12-54). Kumar does not expressly disclose how this predetermined address is obtained; however, Kumar does disclose that the active module determines which standby module will take over for it if a failure occurs (col. 4, lines 44-60). Kumar also discloses that a server module can transmit the address to the clients (col. 5, lines 55-67). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit a path attribute (predetermined address) to the client modules by the active serving module, wherein the path attribute includes at least one network address corresponding to a backup server (col. 5, lines 12-67) in order to have a simplified changeover scheme since the

Art Unit: 2665

active serving module knows the standby server to which communications will be directed upon a failure (col. 4, lines 55-67) and since Kumar discloses that the server modules can transmit the address to the clients (col. 5, lines 12-67). Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar does not expressly disclose inserting the path attribute in the second signaling message. Kadansky teaches, in a system for providing backup of a node, inserting a path attribute in a signaling message, wherein the path attribute includes at least one network address corresponding to a backup in order to ensure quick and smooth re-affiliations (col. 27, lines 13-34). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to insert the path attribute in the second signaling message in order to ensure quick and smooth re-affiliations.

11. Regarding claims 2 and 19, referring to claims 1 and 18, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that the network telephony system is an Internet Protocol (IP) telephony system (Applicant: Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29).

12. Regarding claims 3 and 20, referring to claims 1 and 18, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that the network telephony system is an (Internet Protocol) IP telephony system in which calls are signaled according to the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) signaling protocol, and wherein the first and second signaling messages are SIP messages (Applicant: Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29).

13. Regarding claims 4 and 21, referring to claims 3 and 20, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that the path attribute includes an AlternatePath tag (Kumar: col. 5, lines 12-67 and Kadansky: col. 27, lines 13-34).

Art Unit: 2665

14. Regarding claims 8 and 25, referring to claims 1 and 18, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that the second network entity is determined by accessing a location service (Applicant: Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29).

15. Regarding claims 9 and 26, referring to claims 1 and 18, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that the second network entity is determined by examining the first signaling message (Applicant: Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29).

16. Regarding claim 10, referring to claim 1, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that the receiver, the transmitter, the address resolver, and the assembler compose a SIP proxy server (Applicant: Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29).

17. Regarding claim 11, referring to claim 1, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that the receiver, the transmitter, the address resolver, and the assembler compose an MGCP media gateway controller (Applicant: page 2, lines 5-17).

18. Regarding claim 12, referring to claim 1, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that the receiver, the transmitter, the address resolver, and the assembler compose an MEGACO decomposed media gateway (Applicant: page 2, lines 5-17).

19. Regarding claims 13 and 38, Applicant admits as prior art a backup proxy server and method for use with a network telephony system, wherein the backup proxy server is associated with a primary proxy server (Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page



Art Unit: 2665

7, line 14-page 11, line 29), the server comprising means for and the method comprising the steps of: receiving a first signaling message from a first network entity via a network (Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29) where the backup proxy will receive a message from a first network entity when the primary proxy has failed, wherein the first signaling message includes at least one path attribute including a network address corresponding to the backup proxy server (Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29), where, as broadly defined, the first signaling message contains a network address corresponding to the backup server since the message reaches the backup server; determining a second network entity to which a second signaling message is to be transmitted (Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29); transmitting the second signaling message to the second network entity via the network (Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29). Applicant does not admit as prior art modifying a routing attribute in the first signaling message to obtain the second signaling message. Kumar teaches, in a system for implementing module redundancy, having standby server modules for server modules performing critical functions, having client nodes detect a failure of an active server module, and having client nodes adjust their addressing to a standby module to resume normal operation (col. 2, lines 20-34) in order to have a simplified changeover scheme (col. 3, lines 35-55). Specifically, Kumar discloses that, when clients detect a failure of an active module indicated by the client not receiving an "echo" from an active module, the client adjusts its address table to replace the address of the failed active module with the predetermined address of a standby module (col. 5, lines 12-54). Kumar does not expressly disclose how this

Art Unit: 2665

predetermined address is obtained; however, Kumar does disclose that the active module determines which standby module will take over for it if a failure occurs (col. 4, lines 44-60). Kumar also discloses that a server module can transmit the address to the clients (col. 5, lines 55-67). Kumar further discloses that a standby server that becomes an active server will select a new standby server (col. 4, lines 45-60). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit a path attribute (predetermined address) to the client modules by the active serving module (backup serving module that has become an active serving module), wherein the path attribute includes at least one network address corresponding to an additional backup server (col. 5, lines 12-67) in order to have a simplified changeover scheme since the active serving module knows the standby server to which communications will be directed upon a failure (col. 4, lines 55-67) and since Kumar discloses that the server modules can transmit the address to the clients (col. 5, lines 12-67). Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar does not expressly disclose modifying a routing attribute in the first signaling message to obtain the second signaling message. Kadansky teaches, in a system for providing backup of a node, modifying a routing attribute in the first signaling message to obtain the second signaling message in order to ensure quick and smooth re-affiliations (col. 27, lines 13-34). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify a routing attribute in the first signaling message to obtain the second signaling message in order to ensure quick and smooth re-affiliations.

20. Regarding claims 14 and 39, referring to claims 13 and 38, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that the network telephony system is an

Art Unit: 2665

Internet Protocol (IP) telephony system (Applicant: Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29).

21. Regarding claims 15 and 40, referring to claims 13 and 38, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that that the network telephony system is an (Internet Protocol) IP telephony system in which calls are signaled according to the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) signaling protocol, and wherein the first and second signaling messages are SIP messages (Applicant: Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29).

22. Regarding claims 17 and 42, referring to claims 13 and 38, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that the assembler modifies the routing attribute by changing a routing header, thereby enabling at least one of the first network entity and the second network entity to route any subsequent signaling messages through the backup proxy server instead of through the primary proxy server (Kumar: col. 5, lines 12-67 and Kadansky: col. 27, lines 13-34).

23. Regarding claims 27 and 43, referring to claims 18 and 38, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky does not expressly disclose a computer readable medium including instructions for executing the method of Claim 18 and Claim 38; however, Examiner takes official notice that instructions for a computer readable medium are well known in the art since software is more flexible than hardware. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the instructions in a computer readable medium since software is more flexible than hardware.

Art Unit: 2665

24. Regarding claim 28, Applicant admits as prior art a method for providing fault tolerance in a network telephony system, comprising in combination: receiving at a network entity a first signaling message from a primary proxy server (Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29), transmitting a second signaling message to a first network address (active proxy) (Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29); or transmitting a third signaling message to a second network address (backup proxy) (Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29). Applicant does not disclose as prior art that the first signaling message includes a first network address corresponding to the primary proxy server and a second network address corresponding to a secondary proxy server or transmitting a third signaling message to the second network address upon receiving a transmit error after transmitting the second signaling message to the first network address. Kumar teaches, in a system for implementing module redundancy, having standby server modules for server modules performing critical functions, having client nodes detect a failure of an active server module, and having client nodes adjust their addressing to a standby module to resume normal operation (col. 2, lines 20-34) in order to have a simplified changeover scheme (col.3, lines 35-55). Specifically, Kumar discloses that, when clients detect a failure of an active module indicated by the client not receiving an "echo" from an active module, the client adjusts its address table to replace the address of the failed active module with the predetermined address of a standby module (col. 5, lines 12-54). Kumar does not expressly disclose how this predetermined address is obtained; however, Kumar does disclose that the active module determines which standby module will take over for it if a failure occurs (col. 4, lines 44-60). Kumar also discloses that a server module

Art Unit: 2665

can transmit the address to the clients (col. 5, lines 55-67). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to transmit a path attribute (predetermined address) to the client modules by the active serving module, wherein the path attribute includes at least one network address corresponding to a backup server (col. 5, lines 12-67) and to transmit a third signaling message to the second network address (backup server) upon receiving a transmit error after transmitting the second signaling message to the first network address in order to have a simplified changeover scheme since the active serving module knows the standby server to which communications will be directed upon a failure (col. 4, lines 55-67) and since Kumar discloses that the server modules can transmit the address to the clients (col. 5, lines 12-67). Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar does not expressly disclose that the first signaling message includes a first network address corresponding to the primary proxy server and a second network address corresponding to a secondary proxy server. Kadansky teaches, in a system for providing backup of a node, inserting a path attribute in a signaling message, wherein the path attribute includes at least one network address corresponding to a backup in order to ensure quick and smooth re-affiliations (col. 27, lines 13-34). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the first signaling message includes a first network address corresponding to the primary proxy server and a second network address corresponding to a secondary proxy server in order to ensure quick and smooth re-affiliations.

25. Regarding claim 29, referring to claim 28, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that the network telephony system is an Internet

Protocol (IP) telephony system (Applicant: Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29).

26. Regarding claim 30, referring to claim 28, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that the network telephony system is an (Internet Protocol) IP telephony system in which calls are signaled according to the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) signaling protocol, and wherein the first, second, and third signaling messages are SIP messages (Applicant: Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29).

27. Regarding claim 31, referring to claim 28, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that the network entity is a network telephone (Applicant: Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29).

28. Regarding claim 32, referring to claim 28, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that the network entity is a proxy server (Applicant: Figs. 1-3; page 2, lines 5-29; page 4, line 1-page 5, line 5; and page 7, line 14-page 11, line 29).

29. Regarding claim 33, referring to claim 28, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky discloses that the second network address is specified in a path attribute include in the first signaling message (Kumar: col. 5, lines 12-67 and Kadansky: col. 27, lines 13-34).

30. Regarding claim 37, referring to claim 28, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky does not expressly disclose a computer readable medium

Art Unit: 2665

including instructions for executing the method of Claim 28; however, Examiner takes official notice that instructions for a computer readable medium are well known in the art since software is more flexible than hardware. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the instructions in a computer readable medium since software is more flexible than hardware.

31. Claims 5-7, 22-24, and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar (USPN 6,473,396) in further view of Kadansky et al (USPN 6,507,562) as applied to claims 4, 21, and 30, above, and further in view of Lau et al (USPN 5,774,465).

32. Regarding claims 5, 22, and 34, referring to claims 4, 21, and 30, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky does not expressly disclose that the AlternatePath tag is added to a header of the second signaling message (first signaling message in claim 34). Lau teaches, in a packet communication system, adding additional routing information to a packet through the use of a tag attached to the header (col. 2, lines 33-43 and col. 5, lines 10-29) where it is implicit that this is done in order to provide the additional routing information with the typical routing information in the header of the packet. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the AlternatePath tag to a header of the second signaling message (first signaling message in claim 34) in order to provide the additional routing information with the typical routing information in the header of the packet.

33. Regarding claims 6, 23, and 35, referring to claims 5, 22, and 34, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky in further view of Lau discloses that the

header is selected from the group consisting of a Contact header, a Record-Route header, a Route header, and a Via header (Kumar: col. 5, lines 12-67; Kadansky: col. 27, lines 13-34; and Lau: col. 2, lines 33-43 and col. 5, lines 10-29) where the types of headers (i.e. "router header") can be broadly interpreted to include any header that contains address information.

34. Regarding claims 7, 24, and 36, referring to claims 6, 23, and 53, Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kumar in further view of Kadansky in further view of Lau discloses that the AlternatePath tag is added as an extension parameter to the header (Lau: col. 2, lines 33-43 and col. 5, lines 10-29).

### *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Ryman whose telephone number is (703)305-6970. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:00-5:00 with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (703)308-6602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Daniel J. Ryman



Application/Control Number: 09/685,286

Page 16

Art Unit: 2665

Examiner  
Art Unit 2665

*DR*  
Daniel J. Ryman



HUY D. VU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600